

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed April 6, 2011, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10 and 13-15 were rejected. Additionally, claims 3-5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Additionally, the specification was objected to. Additionally, the drawings were objected to. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 5, 10 and 13. Claim 18 has been added. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 3, 5 and 10 are amended to correct minor informalities.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action appears to suggest that the specification be broken down into separate sections. However, the current application is a National Stage application entered under 35 U.S.C. 371. Applicant notes that 35 U.S.C. 371 has no requirement to break down the specification into separate sections. Therefore, Applicant respectfully declines to amend the specification as suggested. Applicant also notes that section headings are not required and, hence, Applicant respectfully declines to amend the specification to include section headings.

Objections to the Drawings

The current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The labeling of figures with text matter is prohibited under PCT Rule 11.11, except when absolutely indispensable for understanding. Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that “[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11).” In the present application, Applicant submits that the addition of text labels to the drawings is not “absolutely indispensable” because the individual drawing elements are identified and described in the specification. In view of the above rules, Applicant respectfully asserts that additional text labeling is not required in the drawings of the current application.

Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 11 and 16.

In particular, claim 1 is objected to because there is allegedly insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations “the first power supply” and “the second power supply.” Applicant has amended these limitations to recite “the first power supply terminal” and “the second power supply terminal.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that these limitations find antecedent basis in the claim.

Additionally, claim 11 is objected to because the term “data dependent symbols” is allegedly not found in the specification. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, par. [0058] recites that a number of “symbols are used to encode a four-bit signal from input signals on input 25” (Fig. 1, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2009/0004980 A1). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the term “data dependent symbols” is described in the specification.

Additionally, claim 16 is objected to because the term “data-dependent combinations” is allegedly not found in the specification. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, par. [0012] recites “combinations used for encoding different data.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the term “data-dependent combinations” is described in the specification.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s review of the claims and determination that claims 3-5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 3-5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pickering et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0061072, hereinafter Pickering). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not anticipated by Pickering for at least the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that at least one of the combinations of the selectable set of combinations includes more than one of the current level of current to the signal conductors from the first power supply terminal or more than one of the current level of current from the signal conductors to the second power supply. Support for this amendment can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, par. [0058] and table 1 (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2009/0004980 A1).

As amended, claim 1 recites in part:

“wherein at least one of the combinations of the selectable set of combinations includes more than one of the current level of current to the signal conductors from the first power supply terminal or more than one of the current level of current from the signal conductors to the second power supply.” (Emphasis added)

In contrast to amended claim 1, Pickering does not disclose a combination that includes more than one of the current level of current to the signal conductors from the first power supply (or more than one of the current level of current from the signal conductors to the second power supply). Pickering discloses a signal for transmitting symbols on at least three parallel channels, the signal including for each symbol an active signal on each of two of the channels and an inactive signal on the remaining channel or channels, the symbols being distinguishable by which two of the channels have the active signals (Pickering, par. [0011]). Pickering further discloses that one of the active signals is provided as a current of a first sense and the other active signal as a current of a second sense (Pickering, par. [0013]). However, Pickering does not disclose that the signal includes more than one active signal at the current of the first sense (or more than one active signal at the current of the second sense). Rather, Pickering merely discloses that only one of the signals is at the current of the first sense and that only one of the signals is at the current of the second sense (Pickering, par. [0036] and Fig. 5, current flowing from one node to another with two inactive nodes). Pickering does not disclose that two signals are at the current of the first sense or that two signals are at the current of the second sense (Pickering, par. [0013]).

For at least the reasons presented above, Pickering does not disclose a combination that “includes more than one of the current level of current to the signal

conductors from the first power supply terminal or more than one of the current level of current from the signal conductors to the second power supply,” as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Pickering.

Independent Claim 13

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 13 is not anticipated by Pickering at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to the rejection of independent claim 1. Claim 13 has been amended to recite subject matter which is similar to the subject matter of claim 1 discussed above. Although the language of amended claim 13 differs from the language of claim 1, and the scope of amended claim 13 should be interpreted independently of other claims, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejection of amended claim 13.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-12 ultimately depend from claim 1. Claims 14-17 ultimately depend from claim 13. Claims 3-5, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant asserts that dependent claims 2, 6-8, 10 and 13-15 are also allowable at least based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2, 6-8, 10 and 13-15 may be allowable for further reasons.

With regard to claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is not anticipated by Pickering because Pickering does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 10 has been amended to correct a minor informality. Claim 10 recites that the “combination of currents in which no current flows through the power supply terminals is used as an idle symbol to indicate the absence of data” (emphasis added). In contrast to claim 10, Pickering does not disclose a combination where no current flows through the power supply terminals. Rather, every combination of Pickering uses a current flowing in the active nodes (Pickering, par. [0036]). Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully asserts that claim 10 is not anticipated by Pickering because Pickering does not disclose that the “combination of currents in which no current flows through the power supply terminals is used as an idle symbol to indicate the absence of data,” as recited in claim 10.

With regard to claims 14 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14 and 15 are not anticipated by Pickering because Pickering does not disclose all of the limitations of the claims. Claim 14 recites that “the sum is zero in all combinations.” Claim 15 recites that ‘a combination in which currents to all signal conductors being zero are used as an idle symbol.’’ Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 14 and 15 are not anticipated by Pickering for similar reasons to those stated above with respect to claim 10.

New Claims

New independent claim 18 includes the limitations of original claim 1, with the amendments to overcome the claim objection, and further includes the limitations of claim 2 and allowable claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claim 18 is allowable because it includes the limitations of allowable claim 3 including all of the limitations of the base claim of claim 3 and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

Generally, in this Amendment and Response, Applicant has not raised all possible grounds for (a) traversing the rejections of the Action or (b) patentably distinguishing any new claims (i.e., over the Cited References or otherwise). Applicant, however, reserves the right to explicate and expand on any ground already raised and/or to raise other grounds for traversing and/or for distinguishing, including, without limitation, by explaining and/or distinguishing the subject matter of the Application and/or any cited reference at a later time (e.g., in the event that this Application does not proceed to issue with the claims as herein amended, or in the context of a continuing application). Applicant submits that nothing herein is, or should be deemed to be, a disclaimer of any rights, acquiescence in any rejection, or a waiver of any arguments that might have been

raised but were not raised herein, or otherwise in the prosecution of this Application, whether as to the original claims or as to any of the new claims, or otherwise. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce one or more of the original claims in original form or otherwise so as to claim the subject matter of those claims, both/either at a later time in prosecuting this Application or in the context of a continuing application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,
/mark a. wilson/

Date: July 6, 2011

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
1811 Santa Rita Road, Suite 130
Pleasanton, CA 94566
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111